

Message

From: Terry, Robert [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=C02F0BBAADAC4B5AB42C2D5BBCF20465-RTERRY03]
Sent: 11/18/2013 5:26:57 PM
To: Stensby, David [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=7f3ea928a8db486b95b1f758507a38de-DSTENSBY]
CC: Kennedy, John [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=af1a3bc637bd4e82b7bfe77e2ae4ceb1-JKENNEDY]
Subject: RE: TI - RHB CDPH report for March 2013 surveys

The most important matter here is that CalDPH appears to be taking a tough position on the presence of the Ra-226 and/or Sr-90 sources that we have been calling "deck markers." It's well within their authority to do so, so I don't have an opinion on that subject.

The matters that I would have liked for CalDPH to clarify in their report are:

1. Clearly separating the issues surrounding the deck markers from the issues surrounding contaminated soil.
2. Clearly identifying their estimate of the total mass or volume of contaminated soil at each location where they found it.
3. Clearly stating whether or not they found a connection between the deck markers and the contaminated soil.
4. Clearly stating the total radiation dose rate from the deck marker that they analyzed.

From: Stensby, David
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 5:16 PM
To: Terry, Robert
Subject: RE: TI - RHB CDPH report for March 2013 surveys

Hi Rob,

I didn't get a chance to stop by. Could you briefly describe what you think CDPH should have considered? After I read the report, it seemed that a robust investigation of Radium 226 contamination was warranted. There is a Treasure Island BCT Meeting on Wednesday. What would you recommend the Navy do with this information going forward? (I don't want to discuss this at the meeting, I'm just curious what you think. As Medi Sunga says below, I'm sure there will be discussion between the Navy and CDPH at the meeting.

Thanks,

David

From: Terry, Robert
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 9:38 AM
To: Stensby, David
Cc: Henning, Loren; Kennedy, John
Subject: RE: TI - RHB CDPH report for March 2013 surveys

Thanks for sending this report. It was very interesting to read. There are a couple of pieces of information that I would have liked to have seen, that unfortunately CalDPH apparently did not consider.

I did read the article in the Chronicle yesterday and I'm sure it will continue to be a source of controversy. I was surprised by the manner in which they released the information.

From: Stensby, David
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2013 5:08 PM
To: Terry, Robert
Cc: Henning, Loren
Subject: FW: TI - RHB CDPH report for March 2013 surveys

Hi Rob,

The attached report generated a front page headline article in yesterday's SF Chronicle. If you have time, I'd like you to review it and perhaps we can talk tomorrow or Tuesday (I'm out Monday). It seems to have some disturbing new evidence that Radium 226 is more prevalent on TI than was previously thought.

Thanks,

David Stensby

From: Sunga, Remedios@DTSC [<mailto:Remedios.Sunga@dtsc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2013 9:17 AM
To: Stensby, David
Subject: FW: TI - RHB CDPH report for March 2013 surveys

Hi David,

Attached is RHB CDPH's report that is the subject of yesterday's news. Navy and CDPH will be talking about the conclusion in this report.

Thanks – Medi